

ENTOMOLOGY.—*The status of the genus Mymar Curtis (Hymenoptera: Mymaridae).*¹ A. B. GAHAN, U. S. Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine. (Communicated by C. F. W. MUESEBECK.)

The genus *Mymar* has been discussed by Hincks (Proc. Roy. Ent. Soc. London **13**: 38. 1944) and by Soyka (Zentbl. für Gesamtgeb. Ent., Jahrg. 1 (5-6): 180. 1946). Unfortunately I cannot agree with either author.

In the list of type species of the genera of chalcid-flies by Gahan and Fagan (U. S. Nat. Mus. Bull. 124: 92. 1923), *Mymar* Curtis and *Anaphes* Haliday were stated to be isogenotypic, both having as genotype *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw. *Anaphes*, being the later proposed name, was indicated as a synonym of *Mymar*. The reasons for this conclusion were not there discussed, as they were considered to be rather self-evident to anyone who cared to investigate. Neither Hincks nor Soyka agrees with these conclusions, nor do they agree with each other. It therefore seems desirable to state the facts upon which this synonymy was based. These are as follows:

The generic name *Mymar* was first published without description by John Curtis in 1829 (Guide to Brit. Ins.: 112) and credited by him to Haliday. Eighteen specific names were included under the generic name, most of these being manuscript names of Curtis, Walker, Haliday, and Stephens, but names of three previously described and valid species were also included, viz, *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw, *I. ovulorum* Linnaeus, and *I. atomos* Linnaeus. This publication of the generic name *Mymar* in connection with valid species established the name and made eligible for type of the genus any one of the three described species mentioned. None of the 15 manuscript species included can be considered eligible for designation as type. Among the latter was the Walker manuscript name *pulchellus*.

In 1832 Curtis (Brit. Ent. **9**: 411) published a description of *Mymar*, naming as type of the genus *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw. Although naming *punctum* as the genotype, Curtis figured and described only *Mymar pulchellus*, Walker manuscript, and

at the end of the generic description stated that "the dissections and descriptions are taken from the species figured." It is evident from the generic description, however, that Curtis took care to make it broad enough to include *punctum* as well as *pulchellus*.

In 1833 Haliday (Ent. Mag. **1**: 349) redescribed *Mymar* as his own genus but cited Curtis's previous references. Haliday included in *Mymar* the single species *pulchellus*. At the same time (p. 346) he erected the genus *Anaphes* with two included species, one being *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw and the other *Anaphes fuscipennis* Haliday. He made no reference to genotypes.

In 1840 Westwood (Introd. Mod. Class. Ins. **2**: Synop.: 78), ignoring the previous designation by Curtis of *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw as type of the genus *Mymar*, named *Mymar pulchellus* Curtis as the type of *Mymar* and *Ichneumon punctum* as the type of *Anaphes*.

Ashmead in 1904 (Mem. Carnegie Mus. **1**: 363) cited *Mymar pulchellus* Curtis as type of *Mymar* but named *Anaphes fuscipennis* Haliday as type of *Anaphes*. Since *Ichneumon punctum* had already been designated as type of *Anaphes*, Ashmead's designation must be ignored.

From the foregoing statements the following facts are apparent.

1. *Mymar*, as a generic name, must be credited to Curtis and must date from 1829, since it was there published with inclusion of valid species.

2. *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw must be accepted as the genotype of *Mymar*, since it was one of the originally included species and was legitimately designated as the genotype by Curtis in 1832, thus having priority over the designation of *pulchellus* by Westwood in 1840.

3. *Ichneumon punctum* Shaw was originally included in *Anaphes* and was legitimately chosen as type of that genus by Westwood.

Soyka's conclusions likewise are un-

¹ Received March 15, 1949.

tenable, at least in part. This author proposes the new generic name *Oglobliniella* and names as genotype *Mymar pulchellus* Curtis. If *pulchellus* is congeneric with *wollastonii*, as I believe it to be, then *Oglobliniella* Soyka is a synonym of *Mymarilla* Westwood. If the two species should prove not to be congeneric (and on the basis of Westwood's figures there is ground for doubt), then *Oglobliniella* should stand. Until this question can be cleared up, I prefer to use *Mymarilla* with *Oglobliniella* as a synonym. Soyka's action in attempting to name for the genus *Mymar* Curtis an entirely new genotype (viz, *Mymar ferrierei* Soyka) is entirely unacceptable since the species was not an originally included one and the genus already had a legitimately fixed type.

Since *Ichneumon punctum* is the type species of both *Mymar* Curtis and *Anaphes* Haliday, it follows that the name *Anaphes* must fall as a synonym of *Mymar*. This is unfortunate since it necessitates the realignment of the generic and specific combinations for a considerable number of species, but I

can see no way to avoid this except by a complete disregard of the Rules of the International Commission on Nomenclature. The generic name *Mymar* must be used in the sense of *Anaphes* Haliday and authors, and all the species now known and catalogued in *Anaphes* should henceforth take the name *Mymar*. At the same time all the species heretofore placed in the genus *Mymar* must be known by a different generic name, and for this purpose *Mymarilla* Westwood (Trans. Linn. Soc. London, Zool., 1 (ser. 2): 585, footnote. 1878), with *M. wollastonii* Westwood as its genotype is resurrected from the synonymy. It is possible that *Flabrinus* Rondani (Bul. Soc. Ent. Ital. 9: 180. 1877) may be the same as *Mymarilla*, but it seems extremely doubtful that this genus can ever be satisfactorily identified.

The conclusions by Hincks in the paper already mentioned are contrary to those arrived at in the foregoing remarks. In my opinion they do not conform to the International Rules of Nomenclature, and hence are untenable.

MAMMALOGY.—*A new name for the meadow mouse* *Microtus roberti occidentalis* Turov.¹ DONALD F. HOFFMEISTER, University of Illinois (Communicated by HERBERT FRIEDMANN.)

When Prof. S. S. Turov described *Microtus roberti occidentalis* in 1928, he undoubtedly was unaware of the earlier (1848) description by Peale of *Arvicola* [= *Microtus*] *occidentalis*. Peale's name is now regarded as a synonym of *Microtus townsendii townsendii* (Bachman, 1839). Efforts have been made over a period of years to contact Professor Turov and bring this fact to his attention for rectification. In the absence of any word from Turov or any known action that he has taken, it seems advisable now to make the required changes.

Turov regarded the species *roberti* as belonging to the genus *Microtus*. Some other workers have regarded *roberti* as a member of a distinct genus *Chionomys*. However, Miller (Ann. Mag. Nat. Hist. 8: 97. 1908) and Argyropulo (Zeitschr. für Säugetierk. 8: 182. 1933) presented rather

conclusive evidence that *Chionomys* should be regarded as a subgenus of *Microtus*. In reviewing the problem, Ellerman goes farther by regarding *Chionomys* a synonym of the subgenus *Microtus* and places *Microtus roberti* in a species-group other than that of the type (*Microtus nivalis*) of *Chionomys* (see Ellerman, *Families and genera of living rodents*, British Mus. Nat. Hist., 2: 592. 1941).

The subspecies *occidentalis* of Turov is here regarded as a member of the genus *Microtus* and its name thus is preoccupied by *Microtus occidentalis* Peale. This subspecies may now be known as:

Microtus roberti turovi, n. name

Microtus roberti occidentalis Turov, Arb. Nord-Kaukasischen Assoc. Wiss. Inst., no. 44-45: 27. 1928; nec *Arvicola* [= *Microtus*] *occidentalis* Peale, U.S. Expl. Exped., Mamm. and Ornith.: 45. 1848 (type from Puget Sound, Wash.).

¹ Received March 17, 1949.